

From: [Joel Carey](#)
To: Scoping_Delta_Plan@Delta_Council
Subject: input
Date: Saturday, January 29, 2011 10:19:10 PM

Hi-

As an interested member of the public, who has owned a residence in the Delta for almost 30 years, I have one question/request.

Aren't the two "co-equal" goals of the Council mutually exclusive?

Regarding the first goal, i.e., a more reliable water supply, I fully understand how taking water from the north end of the Delta fulfills that goal; it has to be of better quality than water that's already gone thru the Delta.

Regarding the second goal, i.e, protecting and restoring the Delta, I also understand how taking water from the north end of the Delta, as opposed to the pumps at the southern end, is an improvement, at least for the fish, since water won't be forced to run in the "wrong" direction, etc.

However, what I do NOT understand is simply this: If water is taken from the north end of the Delta, there will, by definition, be less fresh water running through, or "flushing," the Delta waterways. SO HOW CAN LESS FRESH WATER FLOWING THROUGH THE DELTA EVER, IN ANY WAY, 'IMPROVE' OR 'RESTORE' IT???" Indeed, part of the existing state/decline of the Delta is that there is not ENOUGH fresh water flowing through it NOW.

I sincerely request that the Environmental Impact Report, or "scope" report, DIRECTLY address this issue.

Thank you. Sincerely, Joel Carey